



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,172	12/11/2003	Robert A. Janssen	SSK-51 (19354)	5946
22827	7590	07/09/2008		
DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449 GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449			EXAMINER MARCETICH, ADAM M	
			ART UNIT 3761	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/09/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING@DORITY-MANNING.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/733,172	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JANSSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Adam Marcetich	<b>Art Unit</b> 3761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6,7,9,10,14,15 and 42-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6,7,9,10,14,15 and 42-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 21 April 2008 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1-3, 7-15 and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modha et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0118837) in view of Elton (US Patent 5,160,790).

5. Regarding claims 1 and 7, Modha discloses an elastomeric glove comprising:  
a substrate body including a layer made of an elastomeric material, said substrate body defining an inner surface and an outer surface (§ [0022]-[0024], Figs. 1-2, glove 20 having inner surface and outer surface); and  
a coating overlying the inner surface of said substrate body and defining a user-contacting surface of the glove (§ [0024], Fig. 2, coating 26),  
an active agent comprising a skin-conditioner, wherein the skin-conditioner comprises a humectant (§ [0054], polypropylene glycol and polyethylene glycols.  
Examiner interprets the limitation of a humectant broadly to include moisture-retaining materials. See online encyclopedia article on humectants.).

Modha discloses the invention as substantially claimed, see above. However, Modha lacks a crosslinked hydrogel network as claimed [claim 1]. Elton discloses a lubricious organic coating (col. 2, lines 18-30), adaptable for coating rubber articles (col. 5, lines 57-61). Elton further discloses:

a coating comprising a crosslinked hydrogel network (col. 5, lines 44-56, crosslinked system);

within which is retained an active agent capable of imparting a benefit to a user (col. 4, lines 34-37, antioxidants),

wherein said hydrogel network is formed from one or more polymers (col. 4, lines 29-53, especially lines 31-33, Poly vinyl pyrrolidone (PVP) ),

at least one of said polymers being formed from at least one monomer that is hydrophilic and water-soluble (see online encyclopedia article on Poly vinyl pyrrolidone. Examiner notes that PVP is formed from vinyl pyrrolidone, a ketone. Therefore it is hydrophilic and water-soluble.),

wherein said monomer is a derivative of a vinyl pyridine (PVP forming Poly vinyl pyrrolidone),

wherein said active agent is releasable from said network when said coating is contacted with an aqueous environment (col. 7, lines 25-35, antioxidants used in amounts of 0.01 – 1%. It is the Examiner's position that the disclosed antioxidants are not bonded to the hydrogel matrix and are substantially releasable.),

wherein the crosslinked hydrogel network is substantially water-insoluble (cols. 3-4, lines 56-60, 65-7), and

achieves a water content of from about 20% to about 90% when exposed to water (hydrogel fully capable of achieving water content of 20-90%).

Elton provides the advantage of reducing friction between a medical device and skin to reduce skin abrasion (col. 1, lines 5-17, especially lines 13-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Modha as discussed with the crosslinked hydrogel network as taught by Elton in order to reduce skin abrasion.

Examiner notes that both Modha and Elton disclose substances interpreted as an active agent. Modha discloses a skin-conditioner (§ [0054], polypropylene glycol), and Elton discloses an antioxidant (col. 4, lines 34-37, antioxidants).

Modha discloses the invention as substantially claimed, see above. However, Modha is silent regarding the capability of achieving a water content of from about 20-90% as claimed [claim 1]. Examiner interprets the limitation of a of water content capability as a result-effective variable, subject to experimentation and testing. There is an optimum water content capability such that moisture content of a coating layer will be balanced with the moisture content of a user's skin surface. Determining this value is subject to experimentation and testing to produce a glove with the best donning and wearing characteristics. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the water content capability to about 20-90% in order to provide the best donning and wearing characteristics. See MPEP 2144.05(II)(A,B). See *in re Boesch and Slaney*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

6. Regarding claims 2 and 3, Modha discloses an elastomeric material of a substrate body comprising natural rubber latex (§ [0023], substrate body 24 formed from natural rubber latex).

7. Regarding claims 9 and 10, Modha discloses the invention as substantially claimed, see above. However, Modha is silent regarding the capability of achieving a water content of from about 35-85% or 50-80% as claimed [claims 9 and 10]. Examiner interprets the limitation of a of water content capability as a result-effective variable,

subject to experimentation and testing. Regarding rationale and motivation, see discussion of claim 1 above.

8. Regarding claim 14, Modha discloses a coating thickness from about 0.1-20  $\mu\text{m}$  (¶ [0036], range of 0.5-20  $\mu\text{m}$  overlapping claimed range).

9. Regarding claim 15, Modha discloses the invention as substantially claimed, see above. However, Modha is silent regarding coating weight as claimed [claim 15].

However this parameter is deemed a matter of design choice well within the general skill of the ordinary artisan, obtained through routine experimentation in determining optimum results. Relative weight of a coating to a substrate is dependent on the coating thickness. For example, a thicker coating will naturally have a higher ratio of coating to glove material. A heavier coating layer will have more lubricity and easier donning ability than a lighter coating layer. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the coating weight ratio as claimed as a mere design choice lacking any criticality of comprising from about 0.001-0.5 grams / gram of a glove, as being merely preferable for the intended purpose of achieving optimum lubricity and donnability. Where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative coating weight ratio of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative coating weight ratio would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art.

“[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” See *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

10. Regarding claims 45 and 46, Modha discloses a humectant (¶ [0054], polypropylene glycol and polyethylene glycols).

11. Regarding claims 47 and 48, Modha discloses the invention as substantially claimed, see above. However, Modha lacks an antioxidant as claimed [claims 47 and 48]. Elton discloses an antioxidant (col. 7, lines 25-35, 2,2'- methylenebis (4-methyl-6-t-butyl phenol), a phenol derivative). Elton provides the advantage of improving oxidative stability. In other words, natural rubber articles are subject to oxidative degradation, which can be slowed by the antioxidant as taught by Elton. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Modha as discussed with the antioxidant as taught by Elton in order to slow oxidative degradation.

12. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modha et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0118837) in view of Elton (US Patent 5,160,790), further in view of Podell et al. (US Patent 4,548,844).

13. Regarding claim 6, Modha in view of Elton discloses the invention as substantially claimed, see above. However, Modha in view of Elton lacks a monomer including hydroxyethyl methacrylate (HEMA), as claimed [claim 6]. Podell discloses a latex rubber surgeon's glove coated with a hydrogel matrix (col. 4, lines 34-43). Podell further discloses HEMA monomers (col. 8, lines 55-63, especially lines 56-57). Podell provides the advantage of high degree of slip against damp or wet skin of a user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the



invention was made to modify the invention of Modha in view of Elton as discussed with the HEMA as taught by Podell in order to provide a high degree of slip when donning a rubber glove.

14. Claims 42-44, 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modha et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0118837) in view of Elton (US Patent 5,160,790), further in view of Zimmerman (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0056276).

15. Regarding claims 42-44, 49 and 50, Modha in view of Elton discloses the invention as substantially claimed, see above. However, Modha in view of Elton lacks a skin conditioner comprising an emollient, lipid or botanical agent as claimed [claims 42-44, 49 and 50]. Zimmerman discloses a cosmetic applicator in the form of a coated glove (§ [0003], [0004], [0018]). Zimmerman further discloses:

an emollient including jojoba and avocado oils, lipids (§ [0021], juices or oils, including jojoba and avocado); and

a botanical agent (§ [0021], juices or oils, including lavender, borage and almond).

Zimmerman provides the advantage of maintaining a therapeutic agent in contact with skin for an extended time period (§ [0031]). Regarding jojoba and avocado oils or botanical agents, Zimmerman provides the advantage of a natural agents that are substantially non-toxic and have few side effects. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the invention of Modha in view of Elton as discussed with the lipid and/or botanical agent as taught by Zimmerman in order to avoid toxicity and side effects of a therapeutic agent.

### ***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 7-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- ❖ WEIKEL, WILLIAM JOSEPH et al. US 20020009561
- ❖ Janssen; Robert A. et al. US 7041367
- ❖ Mueller; Karl F. et al. US 4192827

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam Marcetich whose telephone number is (571)272-2590. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am to 4:00pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on 571-272-1115. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3761

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam Marcetich/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3761

/Tatyana Zalukaeva/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3761